



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS



Megha Middha

Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC - NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR - Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and

learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS

ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

ANALYSING GRAVE AND SUDDEN PROVOCATION IN INDIAN CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE: LEGAL INSIGHTS FROM LANDMARK CASES IN INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW

AUTHORED BY - SIA SETHI

The principal criminal statute of India, commonly referred to as the Indian Penal Code, underwent its genesis during the colonial era of the British Raj in 1850. Following its presentation to the Legislative Council in 1856, this foundational legal framework was formally enacted into law on the 1st of January 1862.¹ The crux of the legal delineation surrounding murder, as articulated in Section 300 of this Code, which establishes a foundational framework for criminal law in India. According to this legal provision, the delineation between culpable homicide and murder hinges upon the presence of explicit intent. Murder, as specified, occurs when culpable homicide is perpetrated with a deliberate aim to cause death or inflict bodily harm of a nature recognized as likely to culminate in death. Within this legal ambit, exceptions and conditions are interwoven, necessitating a more intricate and nuanced exploration and analysis of the statutory landscape.² Expanding upon the foundational structure laid out in Section 300, it becomes imperative to delve into Exception 1 of this provision, which addresses culpable homicide arising from the dynamics of "grave and sudden" provocation. This exception explicitly posits that if an individual, propelled by such provocation, causes the demise of another while in a state of being "deprived of the power of self-control," it results in culpable homicide not rising to the level of murder. The intricate framework of this provision unfolds with the imposition of three specific conditions: firstly, the offender must not have intentionally instigated the provocation; secondly, the provocation should not be instigated by legal authority or a public servant acting within the bounds of their lawful powers; and thirdly, the act should not be justified as an element of lawful private defence.³

¹ Ashwin, (2021) *Difference between IPC and CRPC: CRPC full form: IPC full form*, *Enhelion Blogs*. Available at: <https://enhelion.com/blogs/2020/08/01/what-is-the-difference-between-ipc-and-crpc/>.

² Section 300 Indian Penal Code, Act No. 45 of 1860 (India).

³ SINGH, S. (2022) Case for objective standards to determine 'grave and sudden provocation' as exception to murder – the leaflet, *The Leaflet* – An independent platform for cutting-edge, progressive, legal, and political opinion. Available at: <https://theleaflet.in/case-for-objective-standards-to-determine-grave-and-sudden-provocation-as-exception-to-murder/>.

In the course of delving into the exception mentioned above, as exemplified in the legal proceedings of the case *Suresh Kumar v. State of Delhi*,⁴ it is noteworthy to underscore the extensive legal discourse that unfolded. The High Court of Delhi, in its comprehensive examination of the matter, made explicit reference to the revered Halsbury's Laws of England—a legal compendium of considerable repute which discusses the concept of provocation by stating the following:- *“Provocation may reduce a charge of murder to one of manslaughter. It consists of something done which would cause in any reasonable person, and actually causes in the defendant, a sudden and temporary loss of self-control, making him so subject to passing that he is not the master of his mind. Where on a charge of murder there is evidence on which the jury can find that the person charged was provoked, whether by things done or said, to lose his self-control, the question whether the provocation was enough to make a reasonable man do as he did must be left to be determined by the jury. In determining that question the jury must take into account everything both done and said according to the effect which, in the jury's opinion, it would have on a reasonable man.”*⁵

The concept of "grave and sudden provocation" within legal doctrine serves as an intriguing dimension of jurisprudence, encapsulating the intricate interplay between human emotions and their legal ramifications. Understanding the parameters of this defence necessitates a careful examination not only of the qualifying circumstances but also of the actions undertaken by the accused thereafter. As we venture into this inquiry, we untangle the complex relationship between passion and provocation, aiming to grasp the significant influence emotions hold within the framework of the law with the help of three landmark cases.

KM NANAVATI V. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA⁶ :-

K.M. Nanavati, the accused in question, held the position of second in command aboard the Indian Naval Ship 'Mysore' at the time of the alleged murder. He entered into matrimony with Sylvia in 1949, and the couple, constrained by the demands of Nanavati's naval service, underwent various relocations before eventually settling in Bombay. During their time in Bombay, they encountered Mr. Ahuja, the deceased, who operated an automobile shop and was

⁴ *Suresh Kumar v. State of Delhi*, 2018 SCC OnLine Del 7260

⁵ Halsbury's Laws of England (4th ed.), vol. 11, para. 1163, p. 619.

⁶ *KM Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra* (AIR 1962 SC 605)

then unmarried at 34 years of age. Nanavati, frequently away from his family due to naval duties, observed the development of a friendship between Sylvia and Mr. Ahuja, which evolved into an illicit relationship. The situation reached a critical point on April 27, 1959, when Sylvia confessed to Nanavati about her involvement with Mr. Ahuja. Infuriated by this revelation, Nanavati retrieved a semi-automatic revolver and six cartridges from the ship, ostensibly claiming he would be traveling alone to Ahmednagar at night. He loaded the firearm and proceeded to Mr. Ahuja's flat. An altercation unfolded in Ahuja's bedroom, during which Nanavati declared he would not marry Sylvia. In the course of this confrontation, two shots were discharged accidentally, resulting in Ahuja's death. Following the incident, Nanavati voluntarily surrendered to the police. Despite the jury rendering a majority verdict of 8:1 in favour of Nanavati, acquitting him of the charges, the Sessions Judge disagreed, deeming the verdict untenable based on the evidence. Consequently, the matter was elevated to the High Court under Section 307 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The Division Bench of the High Court concurred, finding Nanavati guilty under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and imposing a sentence of rigorous imprisonment for life. Subsequently, the case reached the Supreme Court. One of the key contentions raised by the defendant was that his actions stemmed from grave and sudden provocation, warranting consideration as Culpable Homicide not amounting to Murder.⁷

The court concluded that the accused's actions did not fall within the purview of Exception 1 of Section 300. The pivotal inquiry related to this exception was whether an ordinary person placed in the same situation as the accused would have responded to his wife's admission of adultery in a manner similar to the accused. The judge cited Viscount Simon L.C.'s assertion that a loss of self-control was a crucial element for applying the exception of grave and sudden provocation. In applying the test, the court stressed the importance of considering factors such as the time elapsed since the provocation to allow a reasonable cooling-off period and the nature of the instrument used in the homicide. The court highlighted that the mode of retaliation must bear a reasonable relationship to the provocation for the offense to be reduced to manslaughter. Notably, there is no universal standard for the reasonable person in applying the doctrine of "grave and sudden" provocation. Instead, the actions deemed reasonable depend on the societal customs, manners, way of life, traditional values, and the emotional background of the accused's society.

⁷ Agarwal, H. KM NANAVATI V. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, Trace Your Case. Available at: <https://traceyourcase.com/km-nanavati-v-state-of-maharashtra-air-1962-sc-605/>.

When Sylvia confessed to her husband about her intimate relationship with Ahuja, the latter was not present. The court assumed that the accused had momentarily lost his self-control. However, even if the accused's version is accepted as true, indicating concern for his family's future and intending to seek an explanation from Ahuja, the court asserted that the accused had regained his self-control and was planning for the future. The subsequent sequence of events, where the accused took his family to a cinema, left them there, retrieved a revolver from his ship under false pretences, conducted official business, and then deliberately shot Ahuja in his bedroom, indicated a deliberate and calculated murder. Even if a conversation occurred between the accused and the deceased, the court deemed it irrelevant to the question at hand, emphasizing that the accused had entered the deceased's bedroom with the intent to shoot him. The mere exchange of abusive words before the shooting, with reciprocal insults, was not considered a conceivable provocation for murder. Consequently, the court ruled that the accused should be punished under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.⁸

B. D. KHUNTE V. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS⁹:-

In this case the deceased, Sub Randhir Singh, arrived at the appellant's bunker in an inebriated state after lunch, where he proceeded to slap the appellant twice and demanded that he follow him. Believing he was being called for duty, the appellant complied. However, once in the storeroom, the deceased locked the door and attempted to force the appellant to remove his pants with the intention of committing sodomy. Upon the appellant's refusal, the deceased subjected him to physical assault, repeatedly punching and kicking him, and making inappropriate advances. After enduring approximately half an hour of torment, the appellant returned to his bunker, visibly shaken and crying. He confided in colleagues and senior officers, who advised him to stay calm and planned to confront the deceased later near the water heater. Despite the ordeal, the appellant carried on with his daily tasks. During his night duty around 9:30 pm, he encountered the deceased approaching him with evident anger. Still in a state of distress, the appellant, fuelled by emotions, opened fire on the deceased, causing immediate fatality. Promptly taken into custody, the appellant faced trial initially in the Court of Sessions, which subsequently transferred the case to the Summary General Court Martial. He was ultimately found guilty of murder and convicted under Section 69 of the Army Act and Section 302 of the Ranbir Penal

⁸ Agarwal, *Supra Note*, 6

⁹ B.D. Khunte v. Union of India and others (2015) 1 SCC 286

Code. The sentence pronounced included life imprisonment and dismissal from service. In response, the appellant filed a writ petition before the High Court, leading to the present appeal before the Supreme Court, where he challenges the verdict and sentence.¹⁰

While acknowledging that the appellant experienced humiliation at the hands of the deceased, enough to provoke him, there is a lack of evidence to support the claim that he was actually sodomized. The appellant's response to the assault, wherein he bore it without immediate retaliation and retreated to his room in a state of distress, indicates that the crucial moment for a potential loss of self-control had passed without any retaliatory action. The appellant's argument that the provocation endured from the afternoon until the night when the fatal shooting occurred is deemed untenable. This is because, in consultation with colleagues, he had agreed to a less severe form of retaliation – a plan to beat up the deceased, suggesting that the appellant's earlier state of heightened emotion had subsided. The court referred to *Mancini v. Director of Public Prosecutions*¹¹, emphasizing that the impact of provocation on a reasonable person is a crucial factor in considering a reduction of the offense. Grave provocation, as outlined in exception 1, involves a momentary loss of self-control that clouds reasoning and judgment. However, the appellant's ability to perform daytime and night time duties post-incident indicates a regained self-control, undermining the argument of a prolonged spell of grave provocation. While the beating and humiliation could be seen as a motive for revenge, the court contends that memories of past events, especially if the critical moment of loss of self-control has elapsed, cannot qualify as grave and sudden provocation sufficient to mitigate murder to manslaughter. The appellant's assertion that the daytime incident constituted grave and sudden provocation when he saw the deceased walking towards him is also dismissed. The lack of evidence showing a fresh act of assault by the deceased renders this argument invalid. The appellant's order for the deceased to halt and subsequent shooting, based on the deceased's failure to comply, suggests a motive for revenge rather than an immediate and grave loss of self-control. In conclusion, the appeal was dismissed by the court.¹²

¹⁰ Agarwal, H. B. D. KHUNTE V. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS, Trace Your Case. Available at: <https://traceyourcase.com/b-d-khunte-v-union-of-india-and-others-2015-1-scc-286/>.

¹¹ Mancini v. Director of Public Prosecutions [1941] UKHL J1016-1

¹² Agarwal, *Supra Note*, 9

MUTHU V. STATE¹³ :-

Muthu, the defendant, was occupied arranging items within his waste paper merchant shop when Siva, the deceased, who collected waste papers from the roadside, entered the shop with a load of papers and cardboard boxes, throwing them inside. In response, the accused, visibly agitated, questioned Siva about this routine, pulling his hair in anger and inquiring why garbage was being dumped in his shop every day. In the ensuing altercation, the deceased pushed the accused. In a fit of rage, the accused, driven by anger, retrieved a knife from the table and fatally stabbed the deceased in the chest, leading to his demise. The trial court found the accused guilty under Section 302 for murder and imposed a life imprisonment sentence, a decision subsequently upheld by the High Court. Challenging this verdict, the accused lodged an appeal with the Supreme Court. The court determined that the accused had lost his self-control due to grave and sudden provocation, which prompted the commission of the offense. The act of throwing rubbish into someone's house or shop, as per the court's assessment, qualifies as a significant and immediate provocation. It is a natural reaction for individuals to become deeply upset when their premises are subjected to such actions, leading to a loss of self-control. The incident unfolded abruptly in the heat of a sudden quarrel without the appellant taking undue advantage or displaying cruel or unusual behaviour. Consequently, the court ruled that the appellant is entitled to the benefits outlined in Exceptions I and 4, bringing the case under Section 304 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). The court highlighted the distinction between Section 302 and Section 304, emphasizing that the former pertains to premeditated attacks with the intention of causing death, contrasting with situations where there is no such premeditated intent, and death occurs in the heat of the moment during a fight. Addressing whether the accused should be convicted under Part 1 or Part 2 of Section 304, the court opted for the latter. The decision was based on the facts of the case, indicating that the accused had knowledge that stabbing the deceased might lead to his death, but the act was not carried out with the intention of causing death. Consequently, the original life imprisonment sentence was reduced to 5 years of Simple Imprisonment, with the time already spent by the accused in jail being set off from the 5-year period.¹⁴

These three cases offer valuable insights into the legal concept of grave and sudden provocation,

¹³ Muthu v. State (2007) 12 SCALE 795

¹⁴ Agarwal, MUTHU V. STATE, Trace Your Case. Available at: <https://traceyourcase.com/muthu-v-state-2007-12-scale-795/>

shedding light on the intricacies and importance of this exception within the realm of criminal law. Each case presents a unique scenario where the accused claimed that their actions were a result of a sudden and grave loss of self-control, thereby mitigating the charges from murder to culpable homicide not amounting to murder. However, the courts' analyses and decisions highlight the nuanced considerations involved in applying this exception:- In *KM Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra*¹⁵, the court emphasized the need for a momentary loss of self-control and scrutinized the accused's subsequent actions. Despite acknowledging the initial provocation, the court concluded that Nanavati's calculated and deliberate conduct post-confession indicated a regained self-control, leading to a conviction under Section 302 of the IPC. This case underscores that the defence of grave and sudden provocation requires more than just the initial trigger; it demands a continued loss of control until the commission of the act. In *B. D. Khunte v. Union of India and Others*¹⁶, the court rejected the appellant's argument that the provocation endured from the afternoon until the night when the fatal shooting occurred. The court highlighted the significance of the timing of the retaliatory action and the appellant's subsequent ability to perform duties, indicating a regained self-control. This case emphasizes that the duration and persistence of provocation play a crucial role in determining the applicability of this exception, meaning that the provocation must be "sudden." In *Muthu v. State*¹⁷, the court recognized the provocation arising from the act of throwing rubbish into the accused's shop as grave and sudden. The court considered the immediate nature of the provocation and the accused's spontaneous reaction without premeditation. This case illustrates that the nature of the provocation, including its immediacy and impact, is pivotal in determining whether the exception applies.

These legal precedents collectively underscore the paramount importance of a comprehensive assessment that extends beyond merely scrutinizing the nature and intensity of the provocation at hand. They illuminate the path for legal practitioners, scholars, and policymakers, encouraging a nuanced exploration of the interplay between emotion, human behaviour, and legal consequences. They display how imperative it is to delve into the subsequent actions and behaviour exhibited by the accused individuals in order to glean a comprehensive understanding of the legal landscape. The doctrine of grave and sudden provocation, positioned as a pivotal legal safeguard, not only facilitates a nuanced distinction between deliberate, premeditated acts and those impelled

¹⁵ *KM Nanavati v. State of Maharashtra* (AIR 1962 SC 605)

¹⁶ *B.D. Khunte v. Union of India and others* (2015) 1 SCC 286

¹⁷ *Muthu v. State* (2007) 12 SCALE 795

by spontaneous emotional reactions but also provides a sophisticated framework for legal analysis. This exception astutely acknowledges the intricate interplay between the rich tapestry of human emotions and the ensuing legal ramifications, presenting a multifaceted comprehension of culpability in scenarios where individuals undergo transient lapses in self-control. Operating as a fundamental legal principle, it navigates the delicate balance of accountability, ensuring that individuals are held responsible for their deeds while simultaneously recognizing the profound impact of intense emotional distress on the intricate fabric of human conduct within the realm of the law.

